

Appendix 13

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

LA UNIÓN DEL PUEBLO ENTERO, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

GREGORY W. ABBOTT, *et al.*,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 5:21-cv-844-XR

OCA-GREATER HOUSTON, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

JANE NELSON, *et al.*,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 1:21-cv-780-XR

HOUSTON JUSTICE, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

GREGORY WAYNE ABBOTT, *et al.*,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 5:21-cv-848-XR

LULAC TEXAS, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

JANE NELSON, *et al.*,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 1:21-cv-0786-XR

MI FAMILIA VOTA, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,

v.

GREG ABBOTT, *et al.*,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 5:21-cv-0920-XR

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff, v.

THE STATE OF TEXAS, *et al.*,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 5:21-cv-1085-XR

**DEFENDANT BEXAR COUNTY ELECTION ADMINISTRATOR
JACQUELYN CALLANEN'S OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO LULAC
PLAINTIFFS' THIRD SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

TO: LULAC Plaintiffs, through their counsel of record.

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 33, Defendant Bexar County Elections Administrator Jacquelyn Callanen hereby submits her objections and responses to LULAC Plaintiffs' Third Set of Interrogatories.

Dated: March 17, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,

JOE D. GONZALES
Bexar County Criminal District Attorney

By: /s/ Lisa V. Cubriel

LISA V. CUBRIEL

Bar No. 24045731

Assistant District Attorney – Civil Division

LARRY L. ROBERSON

Bar No. 24046728

Civil Section Chief

Bexar County District Attorney's Office

101 W. Nueva, 7th Floor

San Antonio, Texas 78205-3030

Telephone: (210) 335-2142

Facsimile: (210) 335-2773

Email: Lisa.Cubriel@bexar.org

lroberson@bexar.org

Attorney for Defendant Bexar County

Elections Administrator Jacquelyn

Callanen

BEXAR COUNTY ELECTIONS ADMINISTRATOR JACQUELYN CALLANEN'S
OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO LULAC PLAINTIFFS'
THIRD SET OF INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Identify and describe all the government interests you purport to be advanced by each of the Challenged Provisions of SB1. Include in your description how each of the Challenged Provisions serves each interest, including any evidence, and whether you contend each interest was in fact the basis for the enactment of each Challenged Provision.

RESPONSE: Defendant Callanen objects to this interrogatory because she is not a state policymaker and had no involvement in the enactment of SB 1, which is a creation of the Texas Legislature. Defendant Callanen cannot speculate as to the Texas Legislature's basis for enacting the Challenged Provisions. Defendant Callanen further objects to this Interrogatory to the extent it seeks legal conclusions which Defendant Callanen is not qualified to render. The information Plaintiffs seek may be found in the legislative history materials or obtained through discovery requests to state officials involved in the enactment of the Challenged Provisions now codified in the Texas Election Code.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: State and describe all instances of which you are aware, if any, of voter fraud in your county connected to:

- (a) any person advocating for "specific candidate or measure" to a voter who is holding a sealed mail ballot;
- (b) the use of "photocopied" signature or signatures other than "ink on paper" on ABBMs.

RESPONSE: None; Defendant Callanen is not aware of any instances of voter fraud as outlined in subsections (a) and (b) above.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: For the November 2022 general election, please provide the following data regarding ABBMS and mail ballots:

- a. Number of ABBMs received by the county;
- b. Number ABBMs the county flagged for rejection because of an application defect of any kind;
- c. Number of ABBMs that the county ultimately accepted after an applicant cure a recorded defect of any kind;
- d. Number of ABBMs the county flagged for rejection because of an Omission Defect;

- e. Number of ABBMs the county flagged for rejection because of a Mismatch Defect;
- f. Number of ABBMs that the county ultimately accepted after an applicant cured either a Mismatch Defect or Omission Defect;
- g. Number of carrier envelopes the county received and reviewed for defects of any kind;
- h. Number of carrier envelopes the county flagged for rejection because of a defect of any kind;
- i. Number of mail ballots that the county ultimately accepted and counted after a voter cured a carrier envelope defect of any kind;
- j. Number of carrier envelopes the county flagged for rejection because of any Omission Defect;
- k. Number of carrier envelopes the county flagged for rejection because of a Mismatch Defect;
- l. Number of ballots that the county ultimately accepted and counted after a voter cured either a Mismatch Defect or Omission Defect.

RESPONSE: The numbers provided below were generated by the Bexar County Election Department's vendor, VOTEC.

- a. 39,655
- b. 1482
- c. 468
- d. 1459
- e. Unable to provide because this is not listed as a separate category in the vendor's software. The vendor does not provide a code.
- f. Unable to provide because this is not listed as a separate category in the vendor's software. The vendor does not provide a code.
- g. 40,189
- h. 662
- i. 39,655
- j. 662
- k. 410
- l. 299